

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alcassedan, Virginia 22313-1450 www.emplo.gov

			1	
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/577,821	04/28/2006	Malgorzata Wesolowska	MID 202	2843
7590 05/18/2010 Horst M. Kasper		0	EXAMINER	
13 Forest Drive	e		SAETHER, FLEMMING	FLEMMING
Warren, NJ 07	039		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3677	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/18/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

10/577 821 WESOLOWSKA Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary MALGORZATA Fyaminer Art Unit 3677 Flemming Saether All Participants: Status of Application: _____ (1) Flemming Saether. (3) _____. (4) . (2) Mr. Kasper. Date of Interview: 14 May 2010 Time: Type of Interview: ☐ Video Conference Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No If Yes, provide a brief description: Part I. Rejection(s) discussed: Claims discussed: Prior art documents discussed: Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED. See Continuation Sheet Part III ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. X It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. /Flemming Saether/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3677 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature - if appropriate)

Application No.

Applicant(s)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Called to discuss the amendment filed 2/4/2010 because it was unclear if it was intended to be entered. After discussions with Mr. Kasper, it was learned that the amendment was not intended to be entered and seems to be result of some confusion associated with the US and PCT applications. It was agreed that a non-responsive would be sent out where applicant will respond with canceling claims 1-21 currently pending the application with new claims 22+ to ensure the proper claims are in the application. Additionally applicant will review the application to ensure the correct specification is the newest one currently pending.